Arguments

No new issues were raised. All issues raised were previously indirectly or directly present in all previous communications with the examiner. All corrections were made for clarity to satisfy the examiner's comments.

The minimum oxidant dosage curve is properly traced. It is described by the function y=1/x, instead of y=log to the base b of x as erroneously stated previously and was previously corrected. The flow charts verify this fact. Since measured values are exclusively employed, all functions listed are employed as best fitting curves for conceptual purposes in the design of the logic flow charts. This was clearly stated in previous communications with the examiner, and can be seen by anyone skilled in the art.

The inventor respectfully asked that any further violations of clarity that he missed be specifically addressed by the examiner and mailed to the inventor. He would clarify them.

The specification of the method employed in the present patent application can be summarized this way – in the Cartesian plane with the abscissa labeled as oxidant flow rate and time, and the ordinate labeled as contaminant concentration, when the desired contaminant concentration is intersected by the maximum or minimum oxidant dose – as defined in the patent application as the tracing of the function of contaminant concentration as a function of oxidant flow rate - the abscissal value of that intersection is the selected oxidant flow rate that maintains the desired contaminant concentration in the flue. It occurs at the time tR as clearly defined in the patent application. Anyone skilled in the art should see this.

The inventor is retired and is a small entity. At this time he does not have sufficient funds to pay further fee schedules other than utility patent issue fees. He requests that all fees be paid within two years of the issuance of the patent, thus satisfying 37 CFR 1.17(e) and 37 CFR 1.114.